

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | F | ILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/648,279 | 08/27/2003 | | Izumi Takagi | 2003_1211A | 4440 |
| 513 | 7590 | 07/26/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| WENDER | OTH, LIN | ND & PONACK, L | TORRES, MELANIE | | |
| 2033 K STR SUITE 800 | EET N. V | V. | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021 | | | | 3683 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | 10/648,279 | TAKAGI, IZUMI | | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
| The MAII INC DATE of this seminariostics are | Melanie Torres | 3683 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005. | | | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| 0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P | ate atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | | | |
| B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 10/648,279

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chamberlain (198) or Alderman et al. (016).

Chamberlain and Altermain et al. teach all the claimed limitations including wherein the housing for the wet braking device has a tilted surface. In Alderman et al. see surface adjacent element 10. In Chamberlain see end of housing 34A.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitai et al. in view of Nilsen et al.

Kitai et al. teach a brake cooling mechanism for a four-wheeled vehicle in which a rotation member of a drive power transmission system for rear wheels is provided with a brake device of the four-wheeled vehicle, the brake cooling mechanism comprising: a

Application/Control Number: 10/648,279

Art Unit: 3683

belt cover (200) having an air discharging hole, the belt cover for covering an automatic V-belt transmission; and an air discharging duct (211) connected to the belt cover. However, Kitai et al. do not teach wherein the air discharging duct communicates with the air discharging hole end the air discharging duct having an outlet part for discharging air, wherein the air discharging duct extends up to a vicinity of the brake device so as to discharge air from the outlet part toward the brake device. Nilsen et al. teach an air discharging duct communicates with the air discharging hole end the air discharging duct having an outlet part for discharging air, wherein the air discharging duct extends up to a vicinity of the brake device so as to discharge air from the outlet part toward the brake device. (Figure 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the teachings of Nilsen et al. to the vehicle of Kitai et al. in order to provide efficient cooling for the brake system.

5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitai et al. in view of Nilsen et al. as applied above and further in view of Chamberlain or Alderman.

Kitai et al. as modified does not teach wherein the brake device is a wet multiple-disk braking device. Chamberlain and Alderman teach wet multiple-disk braking devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a wet multiple-disk braking device in the invention of Kitai et al. as modified since

Application/Control Number: 10/648,279

Art Unit: 3683

multiple-disk braking devices are known for improved the braking effectiveness of the vehicle.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Torres whose telephone number is (571)272-7127. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor can be reached on (571)272-7095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

MT July 25, 2005

> Melanie Jores 7-25-05